



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,527	06/27/2006	Shunichi Oshima	IXIO125417	3698
26389 7590 11/07/2008 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER STU, SARAH	
			ART UNIT 2431	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/07/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/538,527

Applicant(s)

OSHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Sarah Su

Art Unit

2431

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-29, 31 and 33-55 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 June 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/19/07
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/31/08
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☒ Other: Examiner's Amendment

DETAILED ACTION

1. Preliminary Amendment, received on 10 June 2005, has been entered into record. In this amendment, claims 1-10 have been cancelled, and claims 11-55 have been added.
2. Claims 11-55 are presented for examination.

Examiner's Amendment

3. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Gary Kindness on 28 July 2008.

The application has been amended as follows:

In claim 12, line 2, delete "claim 1" and insert "Claim 11".

In claim 13, line 2, delete "claim 2" and insert "Claim 12".

In claim 14, line 2, delete "claim 1" and insert "Claim 11".

In claim 15, line 2, delete "claim 4" and insert "Claim 14".

In claim 16, line 2, delete "claim 5" and insert "Claim 15".

In claim 17, line 2, delete "claim 1" and insert "Claim 11".

In claim 18, line 2, delete "Claim 7" and insert "Claim 17".

In claim 19, line 2, delete "Claim 7" and insert "Claim 17".

In claim 20, line 2, delete "Claim 9" and insert "Claim 19".

In claim 21, line 2, delete "Claim 7" and insert "Claim 17".

In claim 22, line 2, delete "Claim 4" and insert "Claim 21".

In claim 23, line 2, delete "Claim 12" and insert "Claim 22".

In claim 24, line 2, delete "Claim 1 or Claim 7" and insert "Claim 11 or Claim 17".

In claim 25, line 2, delete "Claim 14" and insert "Claim 24".

In claim 26, line 2, delete "Claim 15" and insert "Claim 25".

In claim 27, line 2, delete "Claim 14" and insert "Claim 24".

In claim 28, line 2, delete "Claim 17" and insert "Claim 27".

In claim 29, line 2, delete "Claim 18" and insert "Claim 28".

In claim 31, line 2, delete "Claim 20" and insert "Claim 30".

In claim 33, line 2, delete "Claim 22" and insert "Claim 32".

In claim 34, line 2, delete "Claim 23" and insert "Claim 33".

In claim 35, line 2, delete "Claim 22" and insert "Claim 32".

In claim 36, line 2, delete "Claim 25" and insert "Claim 35".

In claim 37, line 2, delete "Claim 26" and insert "Claim 36".

In claim 38, line 2, delete "Claim 22" and insert "Claim 32".

In claim 39, line 2, delete "Claim 28" and insert "Claim 38".

In claim 40, line 2, delete "Claim 28" and insert "Claim 38".

In claim 41, line 2, delete "Claim 30" and insert "Claim 40".

In claim 42, line 2, delete "Claim 28" and insert "Claim 38".

In claim 43, line 2, delete "Claim 32" and insert "Claim 42".

In claim 44, line 2, delete "Claim 33" and insert "Claim 43".

In claim 46, line 2, delete "Claim 35" and insert "Claim 45".

In claim 47, line 2, delete "Claim 35" and insert "Claim 45".

In claim 48, line 2, delete "Claim 37" and insert "Claim 47".

In claim 49, line 2, delete "Claim 37" and insert "Claim 47".

In claim 51, line 2, delete "Claim 40" and insert "Claim 50".

In claim 52, line 2, delete "Claim 41" and insert "Claim 51".

In claim 53, line 2, delete "Claim 42" and insert "Claim 52".

In claim 54, line 2, delete "Claim 40" and insert "Claim 50".

In claim 55, line 2, delete "Claim 44" and insert "Claim 54".

Priority

4. The claim for priority from PCT/JP02/12943 filed on 11 December 2002 is duly noted.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. In page 6, line 5: "network the portable" should read –network, the portable–;
 - b. In page 11, line 30: "such that it" should read –such that they–.
- Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 11-29, 31, 33-55 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a. In claim 11, line 3: "the destination" lacks antecedent basis;
 - b. In claims 12-29, line 1: "A communication system" is unclear if it relates to "A communication system" (claim 11, line 1);
 - c. In claim 12, line 6: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 12, line 3);
 - d. In claim 15, line 6: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 15, line 3);
 - e. In claim 19, line 6: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 19, line 3);
 - f. In claim 21, lines 2-3: "said communication terminal's storage medium" lacks antecedent basis;
 - g. In claim 22, line 6: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 22, line 3);
 - h. In claim 24, line 3: "the network layer" and "the OSI 7-layer model" lack antecedent basis;
 - i. In claim 24, line 6: "a higher transport layer" is unclear if it relates to "a higher transport layer" (claim 24, lines 4-5);
 - j. In claim 24, line 7: "the transmission source" lacks antecedent basis;

- k. In claim 24, line 7: "preset parameters" is unclear if it relates to "preset parameters" (claim 24, line 5);
- l. In claim 25, line 6: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 25, line 3);
- m. In claim 27, lines 2-3: "said communication terminal's storage medium" lacks antecedent basis;
- n. In claim 28, line 6: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 28, line 3);
- o. In claim 31, line 3: "the network layer" and "the OSI 7-layer model" lack antecedent basis;
- p. In claim 31, line 6: "a higher transport layer" is unclear if it relates to "a higher transport layer" (claim 31, line 4);
- q. In claim 31, lines 6-7: "the transmission source" lacks antecedent basis;
- r. In claim 31, line 7: "preset parameters" is unclear if it relates to "preset parameters" (claim 31, line 5);
- s. In claim 33, line 5: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 33, line 3);
- t. In claim 35, line 2: "said communication terminal's storage medium" lacks antecedent basis;
- u. In claim 36, line 5: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 36, line 3);

- v. In claim 40, line 5: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 40, line 3);
- w. In claim 42, line 2: "said communication terminal's storage medium" lacks antecedent basis;
- x. In claim 43, line 5: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 43, line 3);
- y. In claim 45, line 8: "a network" is unclear if it relates to "a network" (claim 45, line 4);
- z. In claim 45, line 11: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 45, line 9);
- aa. In claim 50, line 7: "organism information" is unclear if it relates to "organism information" (claim 50, line 5).

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 21A (page 9, line 29). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be

labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 11, 14, 17-18, 21, 30, 32, 35, 38-39, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Coelho et al. (US 2003/0130867 A1 and Coelho hereinafter).

As to claims 11, 30, and 32, Coelho discloses a system and method for accessing information using consent, the system and method having:

a communication terminal including a network connector, the communication terminal also including a virtual network switch that can forcibly alter the destination of data transmitted to and from a network connected via the network connector (0019, lines 6-10; 0038, lines 1-6);

a portable electronic device capable of communicating with the communication terminal, the portable electronic device including a security ensurer for ensuring communication security to and from said network using said communication terminal, wherein the communication terminal transmits data to and from said network via said virtual network switch and said security ensurer of said portable electronic device (0037, lines 1-5).

As to claims 14 and 35, Coelho discloses:

wherein checking the security (i.e. ensure permitted access) of said communication terminal's storage medium and applications is performed by said security ensurer of said portable electronic device via said virtual network switch (0026, lines 1-6; 0037, lines 1-4).

As to claims 17 and 38, Coelho discloses:

wherein said security ensurer includes at least one of an encryption data transmission module, a virus removal module, and a firewall (0037, lines 4-5).

As to claims 18 and 39, Coelho discloses:

wherein the encryption data transmission module is a VPN client (0064, lines 6-8).

As to claims 21 and 42, Coelho discloses:

wherein checking the security of said communication terminal's storage medium and applications is performed by said security ensurer of

said portable electronic device via said virtual network switch (0026, lines 1-6; 0037, lines 1-4).

10. Claims 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuwata et al. (US 2002/0129285 A1 and Kuwata hereinafter).

As to claim 50, Kuwata discloses a system and method for biometric authenticated VLAN, the system and method having:

a communication setting information storage unit that stores and holds communication setting information needed for communication with a network via a security ensurer, an organism recognition device, an organism information storage unit in which organism information is prestored and held, and an authenticator for comparing organism information read by said organism recognition device against organism information stored in said organism information storage unit (0011, lines 3-8; 0025, lines 3-5; 0028, lines 1-5).

As to claim 51, Kuwata discloses:

wherein the organism recognition device is a fingerprint sensor (0026, lines 6-7; 0032, lines 4-6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 12-13, 15-16, 19-20, 22-23, 33-34, 36-37, 40-41, 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coelho as applied to claims 11, 14, 17, 32, 35, 38 and 42 above, and further in view of Kuwata.

As to claims 12, 15, 19, 22, 33, 36, 40, and 43, Coelho does not disclose:

wherein said portable electronic device includes an organism recognition device, an organism information storage unit in which organism information is prestored and held, and an authenticator for permitting access to said network via said communication terminal by comparing organism information read by said organism recognition device against organism information stored in said organism information storage unit.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Coelho, as evidenced by Kuwata.

Kuwata discloses:

wherein said portable electronic device includes an organism recognition device, an organism information storage unit in which organism information is prestored and held, and an authenticator for permitting access to said network via said communication terminal by comparing organism information read by said organism recognition device against organism information stored in said organism information storage unit (0011, lines 3-8).

Given the teaching of Kuwata, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Coelho with the teachings of Kuwata by storing information that can be used to allow access to a network. Kuwata recites motivation by disclosing that authentication based on a user's claim of identity instead of a unique characteristic of the user is not secure (0006, lines 2-6). It is obvious that the teachings of Kuwata would have improved the teachings of Coelho by using organism information to authenticate a user in order to verify a user based on a user characteristic, which is unique.

As to claims 13, 16, 20, 23, 34, 37, 41, and 44, Coelho does not disclose:

wherein the organism recognition device is a fingerprint sensor.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Coelho, as evidenced by Kuwata.

Kuwata discloses:

wherein the organism recognition device is a fingerprint sensor

(0026, lines 6-7; 0032, lines 4-6).

Given the teaching of Kuwata, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Coelho with the teachings of Kuwata by using a fingerprint sensor as a device. Kuwata recites motivation by disclosing that using data such as a fingerprint is irrevocably tied to an individual and cannot be realistically transferred, making the characteristic secure (0026, lines 6-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Kuwata would have improved the teachings of Coelho by using a fingerprint sensor as the device in order to use a characteristic that is unique and cannot be transferred for authentication.

As to claim 45, Coelho discloses:

a communication terminal comprising a network connector, the communication terminal including a security ensuring means for ensuring communication security to and from a network (0019, lines 1-4).

Coelho does not disclose:

a portable electronic device capable of communicating with the communication terminal, the portable electronic device including a

communication setting information storage unit that stores and holds communication setting information needed for communication with a network via said security ensurer, an organism recognition device, an organism information storage unit in which organism information is prestored and held, and an authenticator for comparing organism information read by said organism recognition device against organism information stored in said organism information storage unit.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Coelho, as evidenced by Kuwata.

Kuwata discloses:

a portable electronic device capable of communicating with the communication terminal, the portable electronic device including a communication setting information storage unit that stores and holds communication setting information needed for communication with a network via said security ensurer, an organism recognition device, an organism information storage unit in which organism information is prestored and held, and an authenticator for comparing organism information read by said organism recognition device against organism information stored in said organism information storage unit (0011, lines 3-8; 0025, lines 3-5; 0028, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of Kuwata, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying

the teachings of Coelho with the teachings of Kuwata by using organism information for authenticating a user. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 12 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kuwata to the teachings of Coelho.

As to claim 47, Coelho discloses:

wherein said security ensurer includes at least one of an encryption data transmission module, a virus removal module, and a firewall (0037, lines 4-5).

As to claim 48, Coelho discloses:

wherein the encryption data transmission module is a VPN client (0064, lines 6-8).

As to claims 46 and 49, Coelho does not disclose:

wherein the organism recognition device is a fingerprint sensor.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Coelho, as evidenced by Kuwata.

Kuwata discloses:

wherein the organism recognition device is a fingerprint sensor (0026, lines 6-7; 0032, lines 4-6).

Given the teaching of Kuwata, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Coelho with the teachings of Kuwata by using a fingerprint sensor as

the device. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 13 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kuwata to the teachings of Coelho.

14. Claims 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwata as applied to claims 50 and 51 above, and further in view of Coelho.

As to claims 52 and 54, Kuwata does not disclose:

wherein said security ensurer includes at least one of an encryption data transmission module, a virus removal module, and a firewall.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Kuwata, as evidenced by Coelho.

Coelho discloses:

wherein said security ensurer includes at least one of an encryption data transmission module, a virus removal module, and a firewall (0037, lines 4-5).

Given the teaching of Coelho, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Kuwata with the teachings of Coelho by using encryption for security. Coelho recites motivation by disclosing that security can be provided through encryption on the sending end and decryption on the receiving end so that the data cannot be read during transmission (0064, lines 7-8). It is obvious that the teachings of Coelho would have improved the teachings of Kuwata by providing security through encryption so that the data cannot be read during transmission.

As to claims 53 and 55, Kuwata does not disclose:

wherein the encryption data transmission module is a VPN client.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Kuwata, as evidenced by Coelho.

Coelho discloses:

wherein the encryption data transmission module is a VPN client

(0064, lines 6-8).

Given the teaching of Coelho, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Kuwata with the teachings of Coelho by using a VPN client for data transmission. Coelho recites motivation by disclosing that the VPN can provide special encryption (0064, line 7). It is obvious that the teachings of Coelho would have improved the teachings of Kuwata by using VPN for transmission so that the data can be specially encrypted for security.

15. Claims 24, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coelho as applied to claims 11 and 30 above, and further in view of Saksio (US 2004/0105390 A1).

As to claims 24 and 31, Coelho does not disclose:

said virtual network switch is a virtual IP switch incorporated into the network layer of the OSI 7-layer model in TCP/IP, the standard Internet

protocol, said virtual IP switch transferring packets received from said network to a higher transport layer or to said portable electronic device according to preset parameters, and returning packets from the portable electronic device to a higher transport layer or to said network that was the transmission source according to preset parameters.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Coelho, as evidenced by Saksio.

Saksio discloses a system and method for implementing a fast recovery process in a local area network, the system and method having:

said virtual network switch is a virtual IP switch incorporated into the network layer of the OSI 7-layer model in TCP/IP, the standard Internet protocol, said virtual IP switch transferring packets received from said network to a higher transport layer or to said portable electronic device according to preset parameters, and returning packets from the portable electronic device to a higher transport layer or to said network that was the transmission source according to preset parameters (0004, lines 1-8; 0005, lines 3-4; 0006, lines 1-6).

Given the teaching of Saksio, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Coelho with the teachings of Saksio by using a virtual IP switch as the network switch to transfer packets. Saksio recites motivation by disclosing that software can be used to determine where a packet is to be forwarded so that data can be

transferred (0004, lines 1-3). It is obvious that the teachings of Saksio would have improved the teachings of Coelho by using a virtual IP switch as a network switch in order to allow a computer to determine the destination of a packet.

As to claim 27, Coelho discloses:

wherein checking the security of said communication terminal's storage medium and applications is performed by said security insurer of said portable electronic device via said virtual network switch (0026, lines 1-6; 0037, lines 1-4).

16. Claim 25, 26, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coelho in view of Saksio as applied to claims 24 and 27 above, and further in view of Kuwata.

As to claims 25 and 28, Coelho in view of Saksio does not disclose:

wherein said portable electronic device includes an organism recognition device, an organism information storage unit in which organism information is prestored and held, and an authenticator for permitting access to said network via said communication terminal by comparing organism information read by said organism recognition device against organism information stored in said organism information storage unit.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Coelho in view of Saksio, as evidenced by Kuwata.

Kuwata discloses:

wherein said portable electronic device includes an organism recognition device, an organism information storage unit in which organism information is prestored and held, and an authenticator for permitting access to said network via said communication terminal by comparing organism information read by said organism recognition device against organism information stored in said organism information storage unit (0011, lines 3-8).

Given the teaching of Kuwata, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Coelho in view of Saksio with the teachings of Kuwata by storing information that can be used to allow access to a network. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 12 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kuwata to the teachings of Coelho in view of Saksio.

As to claims 26 and 29, Coelho in view of Saksio does not disclose:

wherein the organism recognition device is a fingerprint sensor.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Coelho in view of Saksio, as evidenced by Kuwata.

Kuwata discloses:

wherein the organism recognition device is a fingerprint sensor

(0026, lines 6-7; 0032, lines 4-6).

Given the teaching of Kuwata, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Coelho in view of Saksio with the teachings of Kuwata by using a fingerprint sensor as the device. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 13 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Kuwata to the teachings of Coelho in view of Saksio.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Su whose telephone number is (571) 270-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sarah Su/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Christopher A. Revak/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431